

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 06 2007

Appln. No.: 10/711,190
Amendment dated August 6, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of June 29, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-20 remain in this application. Claims 1, 6, 7, 9-11, 16, 17, 19, and 20 have been amended. No new claims have been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections under judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,353 to Itavaara et al. Applicants maintain that all claims are patentably distinct from U.S. Patent 6,832,353, insofar as the claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103, whereas the claims of the '353 patent have been granted and issued by the USPTO.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-11, and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,988,071 to Gazdzinski et al. ("Gazdzinski"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

In order establish a prima facie case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), each and every feature of the claim must be taught by a single reference. The Office Action alleges that Gazdzinski discloses all the features of claim 1.

Amended claim 1 recites, among other features,

"...mapping each of a plurality of sections of the web page to at least one button of a plurality of buttons on a keypad of the small-screen device, based at least in part on a position of each section within the web page as compared to the position of the at least one button to which it is mapped within the keypad ... displaying on the display only the section of the web page mapped to the selected button."

None of the cited portions (Fig. 2, Figs. 6(a)-6(c), and col. 9, line 42 – col. 10, line 7) of Gazdzinski discloses or even suggests at least the above recited features of claim 1. In particular, the cited portions of Gazdzinski fail to disclose "mapping each of a plurality of sections of the web page to at least one button of a plurality of buttons on the keypad." The cited portions of

Appln. No.: 10/711,190
Amendment dated August 6, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2007

Gazdzinski instead describes dedicating functional keys to URLs such as a weather function key, which when selected, the display would generate and display the map of the United States with hyperlinks for each state; upon selecting a state the display presents with the forecast of weather information in a mixed textual/graphic format; wherein textual, graphic or mixed media displays based on HTML or other language or formats can be generated. Notably, Gazdzinski merely describes a display of a website *in its entirety* upon selecting a functional key dedicated to a URL. The cited portions of Gazdzinski do not disclose “mapping each of a plurality of sections of the web page to at least one button of a plurality of buttons on the keypad”, nor do the cited portions disclose “displaying on the display only the section of the web page mapped to the selected button.”

As such, for at least the above-identified reasons, Gazdzinski fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Applicants’ claims 3-10, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

Claims 11 recites similar features as claim 1. Thus, Claim 11 is not anticipated by Gazdzinski at least for similar reasons as claim 1. Applicants’ claims 13-20, which depend from claim 11, are allowable over the art of record for at least the same reasons as their ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

For example, with respect to claims 3 and 13, the cited reference does not teach or suggest the claimed feature that “...each section corresponds to a frame within the web page.” The Action points to Fig. 6b of Gazdzinski to show this feature. However, the cited Fig. 6b merely describes a display of the map of the entire map of the United States with links to each state when a weather function key is selected. The cited Fig. 6 of Gazdzinski never discloses that each section corresponds to a frame within the web page.

Claims 4 and 14 each recite, among other features, “...one of the sections corresponds to a table within the web page.” The Action relies on col. 9, lines 43-65 of Gazdzinski to show this feature. However, this cited portion of Gazdzinski, which is discussed above with respect to claim 1 neither discloses sections of a web page nor a table with a web page. As such, Gazdzinski never discloses “one of the sections corresponds to a table within the web page.”

Appln. No.: 10/711,190
Amendment dated August 6, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2007

Claims 6 and 16 recite, among other features,

“... a predetermined number of subsections of the one section, the predetermined number of subsections corresponding to the number of buttons to which the one section is mapped; and mapping each of the plurality of subsections of the one section to one of the buttons to which the one section is mapped ... displaying on the display the subsection of the web page mapped to the selected button.”

The Action cites col. 9, line 37 – col. 10, line 22 of Gazdzinski to show these features. However, the cited portion of Gazdzinski merely describes a display of a website *in its entirety* upon selecting a functional key dedicated to a URL as discussed above with respect to claim 1, and further describes that the information system may be programmed to display different information in rotation, where the displayed information for any rotation is displayed in its entirety as Fig. 6c for example, illustratively shows and discussed in col. 10, lines 11-13. The cited portion of Gazdzinski does not disclose section of a web page much less subsection of the web page. Therefore, Gazdzinski never discloses or suggests in any way, “a predetermined number of subsections of the one section, the predetermined number of subsections corresponding to the number of buttons to which the one section is mapped; and mapping each of the plurality of subsections of the one section to one of the buttons to which the one section is mapped ... displaying on the display the subsection of the web page mapped to the selected button.”

Claims 7 and 17 call for, among other features, “...an icon indicating which section of the web page is presently displayed.” The Action relies on col. 9, lines 66-67 Gazdzinski to show this feature. However, the cited portion of Gazdzinski merely describes preset function key and graphic representations with icons to facilitate displaying web pages in their entirety. As such, Gazdzinski fails to disclose or suggest in any way “an icon indicating which section of the web page is presently displayed.”

Claims 8 and 18 recite, among other features, “...the icon comprises a sectional representation of the web page.” The Action relies on col. 9, lines 66-67 of Gazdzinski to show this feature. However, in contrast to the recited feature of claim 18, the cited portion of Gazdzinski as described with respect with claims 7 and 17 above describes nothing more than an

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 06 2007

Appln. No.: 10/711,190
Amendment dated August 6, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 29, 2007

icon representing function keys and graphic for displaying web pages in its entirety. Thus, the cited portion of Gazdzinski never discloses "the icon comprises a sectional representation of the web page."

Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 12 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gazdzinski in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,202 to Hawkins et al. ("Hawkins"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office Action alleges that the combination of Gazdzinski and Hawkins teaches or suggests Applicants' claims 2 and 12. However, claims 2 and 12 depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively. Hawkins fails to remedy the deficiencies of Gazdzinski described above with respect to claims 1 and 11. Thus, even if proper, the combination of Gazdzinski and Hawkins does not result in the invention of claims 2 and 12.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: August 6, 2007

By:

Ross Dannenberg
Ross A. Dannenberg
Registration No. 49,024
1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001